

**ITEM:** Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan and General Development Plan (GDP) Amendments: ZON-00224-2019

**REQUESTS:**

- 1) Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the Phillips 66 Special Use District designation from Rural to Suburban, change the land use mix policies to include multi-family residential, healthcare and lodging and increase allowances for the floor area ratio and building height policies
- 2) ConocoPhillips Campus General Development Plan, 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment (Redtail Ridge Master Plan) to allow a mixed commercial and residential development with up to 5,886,000 gross square feet of building area and 2,236 multi-family residential units

***Supplement No. 2: Public Comments***

Attached are public comments received by City staff following publication of the packet through June 8.

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Support for Redtail Ridge

**From:** Drew Beckwith [<mailto:drewbeckwith@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, June 5, 2020 11:45 AM

**To:** Planning <[planning@Louisvilleco.gov](mailto:planning@Louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Support for Redtail Ridge

Planning Commission -

I am writing in support of the Redtail Ridge Project GDP Amendment to be considered on Jun 11. I've been a Louisville resident for a little more than 10 years and my family has certainly benefited from the smart and balanced approach to growth supported by Council and past Commissions over that time. Downtown is a markedly different place today than it was in 2008 when we first moved to town, as just one example.

I attended one of the public meetings about the Redtail Ridge project, and did a site tour back in the winter (then named the Nawatny Ridge project?). I've been impressed with the development's ability to morph in response to public feedback, I like the improved access to the highschool, and I think the mix of development types are appropriate for that location given the neighboring development in Broomfield.

I honestly feel that something will get built on that site in the future. The city simply cannot afford to have it zoned agricultural or open space for taxing purposes, a point made all the more real by the severe COVID-related impacts to the city budget. If it is going to be developed, best to have it done sooner, and by a local firm who has been so willing to change their initial ideas to meet the desires of our community.

Thanks for your work and dedication to our town,

Drew Beckwith  
101 S Buchanan Ct.

Louisville Planning Commission,

I wanted to take a moment to voice my support for the Redtail Ridge Project and a General Development Plan (GDP) Amendment before the Planning Commission on June 11. The prospect of adding Medtronic, a Fortune 500 company, and its highly educated employees and well-paying jobs, as the anchor for the project is exciting and help inject additional needed tax revenue. The nearly 400-acres of land has not been utilized for many years now and Medtronic will spur positive economic activity for years to come. This opportunity is exactly why the city council unanimously approved almost \$1.5 million in incentives for Medtronic, Inc. to locate on the property. They recognized this development will greatly benefit all of us and retain important jobs within our community which should not be disregarded in times like these. These opportunities are also not guaranteed for the future as the past several years/ decades have shown us. It feels that Louisville is being strangled a bit from a business standpoint, and that this type of project would offer a much-needed breath of fresh air to the city, its citizens, and businesses. Thank you for considering my email.

Cameron Dunford – Partner at Varra financial Associates in Louisville

6/5/2020

June 5,2019

Members of the Planning Commission,

I am starting this letter on June 2nd with hopes of getting it to you several days before your June 11th meeting. It is going to be lengthy as I hope to provide you with sufficient background information to support my views.

The Redtail Ridge rezoning and Comprehensive Plan/GDP amendment has major land-use implications and, as such, is the most significant issue to come before your body in many years. The magnitude of the issue mandates that you consider the rezoning issue in the context of the City's statutory policy on rezoning. Section 17.44.050. – Declaration of policy for rezoning.

A major premise for starting with this statutory policy is the underlining principle that a main purpose of a Comprehensive Plan, and the zoning driven by such a Plan, is the creation of a fiscally sustainable city. Fiscal sustainability is primarily driven by a city's revenue structure. Fiscal modeling is an attempt to project the future impacts of a development using today's structure. It is important to keep in mind it is the revenue structure and not modeling that drives the process.

Key parts of our revenue structure are sales and property taxes. Let's first look at sales tax. "The City relies heavily on sales taxes to fund most programs other than utilities, which are fully supported by utility service fees. Sales tax revenue typically represents about 30% of total City-Wide revenue and about 45% of total General Fund Revenue."<sup>1</sup> While we know who collects our sales tax, there is uncertainty as to who pays it. In past fiscal modeling, it has been estimated that the average household in Louisville spends \$300-325/week on goods and services subject to our sales tax. (See Attachment 1 for a discussion and sensitivity analysis of this assumption. It was done for a citizen training exercise).

As shown in attachment 1, even if the average household spent \$400/week on taxable goods and services, this spending would account for less than ½ of our sales tax collections. This means nonresidents account for over ½ of our sales tax collections. I invite you to do the math.

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 3, 2019-2020 Biennial Operating and Capital Budget, City of Louisville, Colorado.

There are likely two categories of people who spend money in Louisville. Those who come here to shop and dine, and those who come here to work, and while here, shop and dine. I have not seen recent numbers, but in the past, estimates put the number of people working in Louisville to be around 11-12,000. Around 90% of these individuals live outside Louisville.

The above discussion reinforces past findings that, as a whole, residential units do not pay for the services they receive. It further reinforces the need to have a strong contingent of commercial properties if we are going to pay the bills. The goal of fiscal sustainability cannot be met if we continue the practice of repurposing land set aside for commercial uses to residential uses.<sup>2</sup> Doing so undermines the realities of our revenue structure and therefore blocks the road to long-term fiscal sustainability.

Property taxes are the second largest source of discretionary money supporting the General Fund. The Gallagher Amendment to the Colorado Constitution requires owners of commercial properties to cover 55% of the State's property taxes.<sup>3</sup> The effect of the amendment is now to tax commercial property at a rate four times that of equally valued residential property. This multiplier has increased over time because commercial development lags residential development.

This lag affects more than taxes. It requires patience as we receive pressure to repurpose our undeveloped land. In the context of long-term fiscal sustainability, vacant commercial land should be viewed as a form of savings account. This is particularly important as Louisville approaches buildout.<sup>4</sup>

Before moving on, I refer you to attachment 2. This is a piece, recently sent to the City Council, focusing on the concept of long-term fiscal accountability.

I now would like to comment on a few issues that usually come up when we deal with redevelopments and high-density housing.

---

<sup>2</sup> As was done with Steele Ranch and North End.

<sup>3</sup> I am very aware of the talk about having the repeal of this Amendment on this fall's ballot. It will take some pretty creative thinking to get voters to pass something that would have the effect of raising residential property taxes.

<sup>4</sup> As a case in point, two of our commercial stalwarts, Colorado Tech and Centennial Valley, have been under development for 40 years.

- 1) It is often claimed high-density housing is used to create vitality in commercial areas. Sketches showing people chatting under trees with few, if any, cars in sight do not represent vitality. If you want to see vitality in Louisville visit our trails and open space. Visit downtown Louisville and the restaurants in the McCaslin interchange area. Watch five-year old kids playing in a youth soccer game with their parents cheering (actually screaming and coaching) them on. Office parks can stand on their own.
- 2) If we build more housing of any type more people will “live, work and play” in Louisville. History proves this to be nonsense. In the past 40 years, Louisville has had significant growth in both population and jobs. Over this period the number of people who live and work in Louisville has been around 10 percent. It may be as low as 8% right now. People live in Louisville for a myriad of reasons. Additionally, the frequency of job changes in today’s work force further undercuts “live, work and play.”

In summary, I ask you to give strong consideration to the above issues in making your decision on rezoning the Redtail Ridge land. Your decision will have long-term impacts on the future finances of the City of Louisville.

Thanks,

John Leary

1116 Lafarge Ave.

## HOUSEHOLD SPENDING VS NON-RESIDENT SPENDING IN LOUISVILLE'S SALES TAX GENERATION

### Givens

Louisville collected \$16.1<sup>1</sup> M in sales tax revenues in 2019.

Louisville's sales tax rate is 3.65%.

### Assumptions

There were approximately 8,600 households in Louisville in 2019.

The average household in Louisville spends \$325/week<sup>2</sup> on goods and services subject to Louisville's sales tax.

### Analysis

$\$16.1\text{M}/8,600 = \$1,872$  of sales tax collected per household.

Let Y be the amount of household spending needed to generate \$1,872 of sales tax.

Therefore,  $.0365 \times Y = \$1,872$ .

Solving for Y results in spending of \$51,288/household/year, or \$986/household/week, being needed to generate sales tax revenue of \$1,872.

Subtracting the assumed average weekly household spending of \$325/week from the \$986 generated/household, means household spending falls \$661/week short of generating the sales tax revenue necessary to pay our bills.

---

<sup>1</sup> Does not include audit revenue.

<sup>2</sup> This is roughly the amount of spending the City uses when running its fiscal models. This amount includes spending on goods purchased at regional, sub regional and neighborhood retail outlets, as well as the amount spent on the taxable portions of utility bills. It is sometimes adjusted up when the income of new residents exceeds the average household income of existing residents.

$\$661 \times 8600 \times 52 \times .0365 = \$10.8\text{M}$  dollars needed from other than household spending to generate our total sales tax revenue of  $\$16.1\text{M}$

(Check:  $\$325 \times 8600 \times 52 \times .0365 = \$5.3\text{M}$   $\$10.8\text{M} + \$5.3\text{M} + \$16.1\text{M}$ )

### SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

As was pointed out in Footnote 2 above, the  $\$325/\text{week}$  household spending amount is sometimes adjusted up if new residents are projected to have higher than the average Louisville household income.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, sales tax on on-line spending is increasingly being captured.

Let's assume on-line spending and higher marginal incomes increase household spending on taxable goods and services in Louisville to  $\$425/\text{week}/\text{household}$ . How does this change the above calculations?

$\$425 \times 8600 \times 52 \times .0365 = \$6.9\text{M}$

$\$16.1 - \$6.9 = \$9.2 \text{ M}$

Household spending is still  $\$9.2 \text{ M}$  less than needed to pay the bills.

### IMPLICATIONS

Louisville gets less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  its sales tax revenue from residential units. This means we depend on nonresident spending for over  $\frac{1}{2}$  our sales tax revenue. This nonresident spending comes from two sources: 1) Nonresidents coming into the city to purchase taxable goods, and 2) nonresident workers in the City who make purchases while in the City.

Most importantly, we know who collects our nonresident sales tax, but we do not know who spends it.

The nature of these spending patterns has land use implications.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is a somewhat questionable practice for 2 reasons. 1) It assumes there is an unlimited ability to spend money in Louisville. This, at best, is partially true. 2) Incomes of new residents is determined by projecting incomes necessary to purchase homes in the development being evaluated. This method does not account for the equity new home buyers bring to the table.



## Planning for Fiscal Sustainability<sup>1</sup>

### Thoughts from John Leary

For over 20 years we in Louisville have attempted to integrate fiscal planning into our land use planning process. The goal of these efforts has been the creation of a fiscally sustainable city. Although we annually have a balanced budget, and have fund balances consistent with City policies, we really do not know if, in the long term, we are moving towards sustainability. We incrementally perform fiscal modelling on our land use plans and developments and gain little knowledge about our long-term fiscal sustainability.

Why has this happened? A major reason is our failure to ever define sustainability in a way that it could inform land use planning. It was not done in the 2013 Comp Plan which has a set of principles and policies,<sup>2</sup> some useful and some not so much, that do little to define fiscal sustainability. Additionally, the 2013 Comp Plan modelled the increment of growth expected from the Plan.<sup>3</sup> There was no assessment as to whether this increment would have a positive or negative affect on our overall sustainability. It was just done.<sup>4</sup>

One of the Plan's policies is particularly problematic as it has put us on a track of having a meaningless integration of fiscal planning and land use planning. The policy states: "Annexation, development or redevelopment must have a positive impact on the City's fiscal and economic position, especially<sup>5</sup> in historically retail areas...." This policy has led to fiscal modeling at the PUD level to assess a development's fiscal impact. Whatever this impact is, it has little value in determining if we are moving towards a fiscally sustainable City. Defining sustainability involves projecting service levels and capital projects desired by City residents, putting a price on these projections, and assessing our ability to pay for these projections with our current revenue structure and land use mix. PUD fiscal modeling, by design, lets us know if the revenues generated by the development are sufficient to cover the services and capital needs of the development are at a level commensurate with the rest of the City. So, we learn if the development is projected to be fiscally neutral, create a surplus or create a deficit. Unfortunately, since we have not defined sustainability, we have no way of judging the impact on long term sustainability of any of these potential outcomes. A deficit might be okay if a project had social benefits deemed to be worth the impact on sustainability and a surplus may not be okay if it does little to enhance sustainability or offset social impacts.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In this paper fiscal sustainability is defined as having adequate future revenues to fulfill capital and operating needs as we near the physical build out of our City.

<sup>2</sup> Page 51 of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

<sup>3</sup> The analysis indicated the growth increment would have a neutral fiscal impact which could be good or bad depending on how sustainability was defined.

<sup>4</sup> Fiscal modelling has become more of a "check the box" exercise than a decision-making variable.

<sup>5</sup> I do not know what purpose the word "especially" serves given the word "must."

<sup>6</sup> It should go without saying that fiscal sustainability is not a stand-alone criterion. It is a factor in a socio-economic decision. The process does not dictate an outcome.

A second interesting policy is “FH-1.6. The City’s fiscal structure should consistently be evaluated to ensure it supports the desired land use pattern and community levels of service.” In other words, we should “consistently” consider raising taxes and/or fees to get the “desired land use pattern.” This has some merit, e.g., in the context of buying open space and expanding the recreation center, but it should not replace the need for pursuing a land use pattern that promotes the fiscal sustainability of the City.

Now for the good news, maybe. “Policy FH.1 The City should coordinate the need for capital improvements, the need to expand operating programs and services, and the need for revenue prior to the approval of new annexations and rezonings.” If “coordinate” means assess, and if the principle applies to City wide needs, it is a good principle. It supports the concept of defining sustainability in the context of capital needs, service needs and revenue needs.

The McCaslin and South Boulder Rd small area plans moved in the direction of identifying future capital needs<sup>7</sup> in those areas which is positive. However, the assumptions used for revenue projections for revenues and expenditures are poorly documented, if at all, and the revenue projections seem overly optimistic.<sup>8</sup> You might remember the \$ to \$\$\$\$ methodology for pricing capital projects.<sup>9</sup> But I do not want to undercut the point that these small area plans moved in the direction of identifying and quantifying future capital needs.

So, back to the whole concept of fiscal analysis as a land use planning tool. Some good work has been done, but we have done little to achieve the goal of developing a fiscally sustainable land use plan. Or, on the other hand we have done nothing to ascertain our land use plan is fiscally unsustainable.<sup>10</sup>

Focusing on integrating our land use planning with planning for long-range fiscal sustainability is of particular importance when considering changes<sup>11</sup> in existing land uses. As we approach build out, we cannot rely on intuition and uninformed human judgments as our primary planning tools. The room for error is narrowing.

We no longer have the luxury of development for the sake of development, or because of a disdain for undeveloped land. At the same time, we need to recognize that although we are running out of land, we are not running out of time. Different development absorption rates can still be accommodated.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> The main focus was on capital needs with the assumption operating costs would track with current expenditures.

<sup>8</sup> For example, office space is expected to double in both plans and together the plans call for an addition of 500,000 sq. ft. of brick and mortar retail space.

<sup>9</sup> Obviously, \$ to \$\$\$\$ did not go into the mode.

<sup>10</sup> This goes back to the earlier discussion of raising taxes as a means of achieving fiscal sustainability. If that is the choice, we should be upfront about it.

<sup>11</sup> Changes could come in the form of significant PUD amendment, amendments to general development plans, and rezonings.

<sup>12</sup> CTC and Centennial Valley have been under development for forty years or more and both are significant contributors to our fiscal well-being.

Before considering a zoning change or a change to a general development plan, we need to take a thorough look at the fiscal sustainability of our current land use plan. This would involve assessing the adequacy of our current service levels, and most importantly assessing our ability to finance our unmet capital needs<sup>13</sup>. Our two small area plans were a start on this, but more needs to be done.

Again, before this is done, we need to define fiscal sustainability. This should not be difficult as most of the capital and service needs are in various documents or in the heads of Councilmembers and staff. A definition would likely be in the form of monetizing capital needs and service needs along with creating a set of sustainability principles.<sup>14</sup>

Changes in land uses also require a fiscal analysis methodology different than the above traditional “PUD” approach. To assess the impact on overall fiscal sustainability it is critical to know the delta between the fiscal impact of various densities under existing land uses to the development proposed under the requested change in land use. This methodology should also be applied to assessing the impact of newly adopted Comp Plans.

I would like to summarize in this way. We need to decide what role we want land-use decisions to play in achieving fiscal sustainability. We have a triad of tradeoff’s involving land-use, taxes, and the aspirations we have for our City. Our citizens deserve full transparency as we make these decisions.

---

<sup>13</sup> Jumping out at us are Highway 42 and a number of underpasses that were a public priority in the small area plan process. Additionally, the rolling number of developer-built streets needing replacement continues to grow.

<sup>14</sup>Principles could address such issues as the priority put on the role of land decisions vs tax increases in planning for fiscal sustainability.

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge Project

---

**From:** Marc Sisler [<mailto:marc.sisler.eclg@statefarm.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, June 5, 2020 12:48 PM

**To:** Planning <[planning@Louisvilleco.gov](mailto:planning@Louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge Project

Louisville Planning Commission-

I strongly support the Redtail Ridge Project and a General Development Plan (GDP) Amendment before the Planning Commission on June 11. The prospect of having Medtronic, a Fortune 500 company, and its highly educated employees and well-paying jobs, as the anchor for the project is exciting. The nearly 400-acres of land has not been utilized for many years now and Medtronic will spur positive economic activity for years to come. This opportunity is exactly why the city council unanimously approved almost \$1.5 million in incentives for Medtronic, Inc. to locate on the property. They recognized this development will greatly benefit all of us and retain important jobs within our community which should not be disregarded in times like these.

Thank you,  
Marc Sisler

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge - NO to residential housing

---

**From:** Scott MacLaughlin <[STMacLaughlin@msn.com](mailto:STMacLaughlin@msn.com)>

**Sent:** Saturday, June 6, 2020 5:33 PM

**To:** Citizen Inquiries <[info@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:info@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge - NO to residential housing

I am strongly opposed to the 900,000 sf of residential housing. Each house will have 2+ cars which will exponentially increase the traffic in the surrounding areas. The prior GDP submittal had zero residential housing, so residential housing is not a requirement for this to be viable. I recommend they keep this area as open space and maintain their namesake (redtail hawks).

Regards,

Scott MacLaughlin  
303-886-1448

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge Application

**From:** Robert Kline [<mailto:rkline3443@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 1:45 PM

**To:** City Council <[Council@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:Council@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge Application

Dear Council:

I am a long time resident of Louisville having moved here from Denver in 1984. I raised my children in this wonderful city and have started three businesses which have located within the city as well.

I have reviewed the Redtail Ridge development plan and I am in full support of this project. I believe this type of development of this important piece of land is vital to the long term health of our community. I hope you will support the development and current application as well.

Regards,  
Robert Kline  
347 Walnut Lane  
Louisville, CO 80027

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge

---

**From:** cheryl professionalplacementpartners.com [<mailto:cheryl@professionalplacementpartners.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 3:30 PM

**To:** Ashley Stolzmann <[ashleys@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:ashleys@louisvilleco.gov)>; Dennis Maloney <[DennisM@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:DennisM@louisvilleco.gov)>; Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Cc:** Warren Merlino <[wfmerlino@aol.com](mailto:wfmerlino@aol.com)>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge

Hi Mayor Stolzmann and City Council,

We strongly support the Redtail Ridge Project and a General Development Plan (GDP) Amendment before the Planning Commission on June 11. The prospect of having Medtronic, a Fortune 500 company, and its highly educated employees and well-paying jobs, as the anchor for the project is exciting. The nearly 400-acres of land has not been utilized for too many years now and Medtronic will spur positive economic activity for years to come!

This opportunity is exactly why the city council unanimously approved almost \$1.5 million in incentives for Medtronic, Inc. to locate on the property. They recognized this development will greatly benefit all of us and retain important jobs within our community which should not be disregarded in times like these.

We are also supportive of changing the traffic patterns in that area to accommodate the new project (Monarch High School access, access to Highway 36, access from Northwest Parkway, etc). We also support mixed use retail, commercial, and residential at Redtail Ridge, as well.

Thank you for your consideration!

Cheryl & Warren Merlino

631 Manorwood Lane

Louisville, CO 80027

(303) 604-0600

Email: [WFMerlino@aol.com](mailto:WFMerlino@aol.com) and [Cheryl@ppp.jobs](mailto:Cheryl@ppp.jobs)

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge Project

---

**From:** Terrerushton [<mailto:terrerushton@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 5:24 PM

**To:** City Council <[Council@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:Council@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge Project

I have lived in Louisville since 1985. Since Storage Tek left their Louisville campus, my family and I have worried about what would be developed at the site. We were disheartened after the ConocoPhillips project did not come to fruition and the land sat empty for many years.

I enthusiastically support the Redtail Ridge Project and a General Development Plan (GDP) Amendment. The plan strikes the right balance between the need to invest in Louisville's future while still maintaining a livable, innovative and economically diverse community. The developer has been willing to listen to our community and the City and modify its plans based on that feedback. Density has been lowered and open space and trail networks reconfigured to create connectivity to surrounding communities. The traffic improvements will enhance circulation around and through the site. I am especially pleased with the addition of affordable housing units. Affordable housing for our children and seniors has been a continuing problem within this community.

The Redtail Ridge Project brings Louisville new Open Space, Parks, and secures a Fortune 500 anchor in Medtronic, which is greatly needed in these economic times.

I urge you to approve the amendments.

Terre Rushton  
303-956-8338 cell

Please excuse any typos. This is sent from my mobile device.



**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Comments on Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan and General Development Plan

**From:** Craig W. Wright [<mailto:kungfucraig@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 7:14 PM

**To:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Comments on Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan and General Development Plan

Hi,

I've been reading through the Redtail Ridge plan. Overall it seems like a rather bad idea.

I have a few questions and observations:

What does it mean to add 2000+ residences vis-a-vis our schools? As far as I can tell, Monarch K-8 and Monarch High cannot support this.

We have A TON of vacant shopping center space in Louisville near McCaslin and Dillon. Moreover, there are significant vacancies around Flatirons Mall. What is the purpose of creating more?

Widening parts of Dillon and 96th should be part of any plan like this. Colorado roads are terrible. Adding more people will just make them worse. US-36, despite just being rebuilt, is already horrible. There has to be a plan to widen/improve roads if this development is to go forward.

I'm generally opposed to dense residential as well. Doing something more along the lines of Heritage would be much better. Larger lots, more space, less people. Some multi-family housing would not be bad, but allowing 5 stories seems like too much.

Why not consider breaking the area up into 0.5 acre lots and allowing them to be sold for residential use?

Why not purchase as open space?

Thanks,  
Craig Wright  
634 W Dahlia St.

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge

---

**From:** Mark Zaremba [<mailto:mark@gozaremba.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 11:28 AM  
**To:** City Council <[Council@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:Council@louisvilleco.gov)>  
**Cc:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>  
**Subject:** Redtail Ridge

Hi neighbors, thank you for, hopefully, taking a moment to read.

My wife Jacque and I have looked at the plans for the RR development and conclude moving forward would be a positive step for our City.

I'd like to preface the rest of this by stating I am NOT a fan of random growth. I grew up in Colorado and it makes me sad to see the soulless sprawl on the front range. That said, I am not anti-growth. I am a fan of smart growth, and I believe this project meets that definition.

The plan is a solid start. The trails, parks and, hopefully, an outdoor recreation facility, will be an asset to our community. And speaking of community, I am positive Louisville's authentic sense of community will not be mitigated in any way by Redtail Ridge.

I also see this as an opportunity for Louisville to recharge our creative and innovative batteries. RR will provide revenue that will help great ideas - whether they come from the Cultural Council, Arts Council, City Council, DBA or an individual - have the potential of actually happening. Money does that.

Sincere thanks to all of you for investing the time and effort to represent our city.

Sincerely,  
Mark Zaremba

ZAREMBA  
Graphic + Web Solutions  
303.604.6378  
[gozaremba.com](http://gozaremba.com)

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge

**From:** Jessie Bliss [<mailto:jessiebliss@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Sunday, June 7, 2020 8:18 PM

**To:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge

Dear Planning Commission,

I respectfully request the Planning Commission support of the Redtail Ridge Project and General Development Plan (GDP) Amendment on June 11<sup>th</sup>. The new development will bring much needed economic benefits to the City of Louisville with no additional tax burden to residents. In addition to new tax revenue, the project will fund more than \$122 million in road, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements on and off the site. The offsite improvements – including additional turn lanes, pedestrian underpasses and trail connections - are long overdue. In fact, many of the improvements are needed even without this development and would not be possible without the financial contribution of the development. Given the uncertain economy, and recent loss of jobs, we cannot afford to lose this opportunity for Louisville.

Thank you for your time,  
Jessie Bliss

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Stop RedTail Ridge Development

---

**From:** Weiyan Chen <weiyanch@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 3:50 PM

**To:** Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>

**Subject:** Stop RedTail Ridge Development

Dear Mr. Zuccaro,

I am writing this letter to tell you that I am against the development plan. Here are the reasons:

1. The plan is too big for a small town like Louisville. We will lose the small town's character that we work so hard to keep. Louisville is so attractive for the people to live or visit because of the small town character.
2. The impact on wildlife. I don't have to give you the details of the wildlife on the property since the wildlife advocates already send to you. However, this development does not only impact wildlife in Louisville but Superior side too. The Hodgson-Harris Reservoir is just in other side of US 36 from this development. Over hundred kinds of birds and other animals rely on the reservoir's water. Heavy development in our side will impact or wipe out the wild animals.
3. Such big plan shall be approved by Louisville residents. Public hearing shall be hold in PERSON not virtue meeting during once a hundred years pandemic. I wonder there are more details to hide from the developer who picks this timing.

Please pass my concerns to the members of the planning commission. Thank you

Weiyan Chen  
146 Cherrywood Lane

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge

From: **Kevin Delaney** <[grayhorseelectric@gmail.com](mailto:grayhorseelectric@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 8:21 AM  
Subject: Redtail Ridge  
To: <[ashleys@louisvilleco.g0v](mailto:ashleys@louisvilleco.g0v)>

Dear Mayor Stolzmann,

I am writing today out of concern for the proposed Redtail Ridge development. I just sent a synopsis of my concerns to the Planning Commission and wanted to drop you a note as well.

I specifically voted for you due to your vocal support of the environment. Please do what you can to ensure the existing plan does not slip through the planning process without tough questions being asked.

Think of the climate costs this development will incur including increased traffic, decreased open space and native species; excessive pressures on our existing infrastructure and our already limited supply of fresh, clean water.

With the onslaught of this global pandemic, let's step back for a bit, take a deep breath and ask ourselves what the future holds for commercial real estate and our economy. Will we revert to our customary modes of commerce or will we turn to a more remote way of doing business?

Sure this site is going to be developed but let's do it in a thoughtfully, community supported way. Schedule the public hearing when it's safe to have an in person hearing that's open to all residents and advertised clearly. This development is much too large and important to quietly slip through now. Ask yourself if this is the legacy you want to leave for future generations.

Thanks for your time.

Regards,

Kevin Delaney

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Regarding Proposed Office Development by Medtronic

---

**From:** Dinakar Dinnu <[dinakar.dinnu@gmail.com](mailto:dinakar.dinnu@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 4:50 PM

**To:** City Council; Planning Commission

**Subject:** Regarding Proposed Office Development by Medtronic

Dear elected officials for the City of Louisville,

I am writing in support of the proposed office development by Ryan Companies and Medtronic to be built at Redtail Ridge.

I believe this project as proposed will support the livability and positive economic position we have in Louisville. I have confidence that this project will attract more employees, bring new residents to the City, and generally strengthen the community.

With consideration of its adherence to sustainability, the neighboring businesses and residents, and the safety of the community, again, I am writing in support of Ryan Companies' development at Redtail Ridge.

Sincerely,

--

P.Dinakar



Certified  
Six Sigma Black Belt

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge development at the old Conoco Phillips / Storage Tek site,

**From:** Linda Du <4lindadu@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 2:48 PM

**To:** Rob Zuccaro <rzuccaro@louisvilleco.gov>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge development at the old Conoco Phillips / Storage Tek site,

Hi, Rob,

We live in a great town with a small town feel and we need to keep it that way. A developer, with a well-connected PR firm, wants a huge development at the Storage Tek site with buildings three times the size of Storage Tek! With buildings up to five stories high. The Redtail Ridge development will bring lots more traffic congestion, pollution, not near enough open space and no community separation from Broomfield, also destroyed the wildlife currently in the site.

I agree, Louisville needs some development at the old Storage Tek site, but not huge one, not five stores ones. Please tell the developer their proposal is way, way too big. The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek.

As residents of Louisville, my husband and I objected to the plan.

Zhong Chao Wu and Linda Du

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Need more development

---

**From:** Chrisgabriel101 [<mailto:chrisgabriel101@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 7:23 AM

**To:** City Council <[Council@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:Council@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Need more development

Hi

I'm in favor of the new development proposal at the Storage Tek site. We need more development if we want to keep our town thriving and this will definitely help.

Thanks

Chris



**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Storage Tek site

**From:** Kristin Kerr Gannon [<mailto:kkgannon7@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 8:08 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>  
**Subject:** Storage Tek site

Dear Louisville Planning Commission-

I am a teacher at Monarch High School, and I have just learned that The Redtail Ridge development company is planning to expand the Storage Tek site with 60% more buildings, with high rises 5 stories high, and added housing and traffic congestion. Please do not approve of their excessive building plans.

Traffic is already a problem on our school campus, and the loss of open space on this corridor is tragic. Open space is what makes our community so beautiful. Once you develop it- it will be gone for good. As you know, Boulder County has strict line of sight building codes to preserve the beauty and skyline of our community. Please honor these codes.

I understand that you want some development on that site for revenue, but please be mindful of the needs of the community and the environment.

This is far too much development to go next door to our grade school and high school.

Thank you for your time, Kristin Kerr Gannon, Social Studies Educator

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge development

---

**From:** Jana Ikeda [<mailto:jikeda@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 8:33 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>  
**Subject:** Redtail Ridge development

Planning Commission of Louisville Colorado:

I believe that Louisville is one of the best small towns in the U.S. Many agree, as it has been voted such many times in recent years.

Change is the only constant. I see the need for some development in the old Storage Tek site, but the community needs to have some input. An in-person meeting would be appropriate when able.

Please consider the needs and desires of the Louisville residents.

Sincerely,  
Jana Ikeda  
Louisville resident

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

## Rob Zuccaro

---

**Subject:** FW: please storage tech build

**From:** kelly [<mailto:mustharley@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 8:21 AM

**To:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** please storage tech build

Hi I live across from this site in Superior . Please rethink the size of the building that they builder is asking to do. It is out of control with the building that is going on . Here in Superior they are letting building on ever piece of land. 88th is already over capacity. Tonight our town board is looking at approving another townhouse building on 88th. Please please please really look over what is being asked. Once the land is gone it is gone. Louisville and Superior are heading into looking like Denver . Wall to wall building. Ask your selfs how is it in the best interest to the community.

This is copied from someone else but they are spot on.

thank you

kelly macaulay

1950 shamrock drive

superior co 80027

We live in a great town with a small town feel and we need to keep it that way. A developer, with a well-connected PR firm, wants a huge development at the Storage Tek site with buildings three times the size of Storage Tek! With buildings up to five stories high. The Redtail Ridge development will bring lots more traffic congestion with ozone creating, climate changing pollution, pressure on housing, not near enough open space and no community separation from Broomfield.

I agree, Louisville needs some development at the old Storage Tek site, but not 5 million square feet? This will only change if you participate!

Please ask the Louisville Planning Commission to:

- 1) Tell the developer their proposal is way, way too big. The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger that Storage Tek, and to vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.
- 2) Schedule the public hearing--on the biggest Louisville land use and development decision in decades--when it is safe to have an in-person hearing that is open to all, not just those who want to risk it in a pandemic. And the city should actively advertise the hearings. This is way too important to quietly slip through now.

H

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge - Medtronic

**From:** Heather McKernan <[heather.lee.roach@gmail.com](mailto:heather.lee.roach@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 4:36 PM

**To:** City Council

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge - Medtronic

Dear elected officials for the City of Louisville,

I am writing in support of the proposed office development by Ryan Companies and Medtronic to be built at Redtail Ridge. I believe this project as proposed will support the livability and positive economic position we have in Louisville. I have confidence that this project will attract more employees, bring new residents to the City, and generally strengthen the community. With consideration of its adherence to sustainability, the neighboring businesses and residents, and the safety of the community, again, I am writing in support of Ryan Companies' development at Redtail Ridge.

Sincerely, Heather McKernan

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Red tail Ridge

**From:** Maxine Most <[cmaxmost@me.com](mailto:cmaxmost@me.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 8:17 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Ashley Stolzmann; [Council@louusvilleco.gov](mailto:Council@louusvilleco.gov)  
**Subject:** Red tail Ridge

While I had high hopes after the very first public meeting by the developer for Redtail Ridge, I am now firmly opposed to the planned development at this site in its current form.

Beyond the absurdity of offering Medtronic - a multi billion dollar company headquartered outside of the US to avoid paying US taxes - generous incentives that were offered without a cost benefit analysis, this project is too big, and inconsistent with the community of Louisville.

The developer also initially promised no residential development beyond a senior community. This has now changed as well. Classic bait and switch for nearly every development in town - promise commercial development then claim they need more residential to make it viable.

If the developer and Medtronic are So interested in “helping our community” - which is what they are paying their PR agency a sizable sum to convince the community of 1 why do they need so many concessions?

The last virtual meeting the developer held was a scripted PR show where questions were screened and they would not address issues by citizens who demonstrated any opposition or concerns about the project.

It is time for the planning commission and the City Council to consider the long term implications for our community and at the VERY LEAST the planning commission and/or the City Council must:

**1) Tell the developer their proposal is way, way too big.** The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek, and to vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.

**2) Schedule the public hearing--**on the biggest Louisville land use and development decision in decades--**when it is safe to have an in-person hearing** that is open to all, not just those who want to risk it in a pandemic. And the city should actively advertise the hearings. This is way too important to quietly slip through now.

Respectfully,

Maxine Most

C. Maxine Most  
640 W Linden St  
Louisville, CO  
720 530 5836

## Rob Zuccaro

---

**Subject:** FW: Please protect us

**From:** Michelle Reddy <[Michelle\\_Reddy@comcast.net](mailto:Michelle_Reddy@comcast.net)>

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 8:21 AM

**To:** Planning Commission

**Cc:** Ashley Stolzmann

**Subject:** Please protect us

Dear Louisville Planning Commission:

Please, please, protect us and the small town feel of our great town that continues to rate as one of the best places to live in the United States. Don't let anyone steal this from us. Defend us from the outrageous Redtail Ridge **OVER**development proposal at the Storage Tek site. If it requires a large PR firm to try to slip this past you, it is obviously not the right thing to do. As is, the proposal is not compatible with the design of Louisville and will bring traffic congestion, create pollution, pressure on housing, remove important open space, and obliterate community separation from Broomfield. It will be the death knell of our cherished town and forever and irrevocably change who we are for the worst. We are relying on you to:

1) **Tell the developer their proposal is way, way too big.** If we are even going to consider this proposal, have them reduce it to what was approved for ConocoPhillips **AT THE MOST**, which was already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek. Vote **NO** on the development plan and PUD currently on the agenda.

2) **WAIT to schedule the public hearing** on the biggest, most severe Louisville land use and development decision in decades. Don't let them slip it by while we are staying home because of the pandemic. Wait until it is **safe to have an in-person hearing** that is open to all and well-advertised.

I beg you....Louisville is a special place, and while it is important to move forward, our development must be smart and ensure that it is in line with who and where we are. Let's not rape our limited, precious space with short-sighted ambition and sell out our families to a greedy developer who does not care about us. We trust you will protect us and see beyond the PR hype...if it were so good for us, a PR firm would not be required. Louisville still belongs to us, and we need you to keep it that way. Make them do it **OUR** way or send them on **THEIR** way.

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Please Don't ruin Louisville

-----Original Message-----

From: mark riemer [mailto:coloradohouses@me.com]

Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 9:19 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Cc: Ashley Stolzmann <ashleys@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Please Don't ruin Louisville

Hi,

I live in Louisville. Please don't allow Redtail to overcrowd Louisville. We don't want to be Broomfield. While I have your attention, please don't spend extra money naming the green areas around town. Now's the time to be thrifty.

Thanks,  
Mark



**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Storage Tek site

-----Original Message-----

From: Marci Sannes [mailto:marci.sannes@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 9:14 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Storage Tek site

I have lived in Louisville for almost 20 years and have obviously seen a lot of change - some good - revitalized old town!, some less so. But the development plans for the Storage Tek site are the worst thing I have seen in my time here.

We live in a great town with a small town feel which is why we all moved here. This developer, with a well-connected PR firm, wants a huge development at the Storage Tek site with buildings three times the size of Storage Tek! With buildings up to five stories high. The Redtail Ridge development will bring lots more traffic congestion with ozone creating, climate changing pollution, pressure on housing, not near enough open space and no community separation from Broomfield. Issues with school crowding and other infrastructure issues which developers are not addressing.

I agree, Louisville needs some development at the old Storage Tek site, but not 5 million square feet. That's ridiculous.

Louisville Planning Commission should:

- 1) Tell the developer their proposal is way, way too big. The developer should come back with a plan the MAXIMUM size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek, and to VOTE NO on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.
- 2) Schedule the public hearing--on the biggest Louisville land use and development decision in decades--when it is safe to have an in-person hearing that is open to all, not just those who want to risk it in a pandemic. And the city should actively advertise the hearings. This is way too important to quietly slip by citizens.
- 3) The city/open space committee needs to review again the open space purchase of the Daughenbaugh property. This should have been a no brainer purchase.

By the way, as I'm sure the commission knows, Boulder County does not support this proposal because of its size and all the regional traffic, housing and environmental impacts it will create and it is contrary to the intent of the Northwest Parkway Intergovernmental Agreement which "...is intended to preclude increased development and urban sprawl that would obliterate the boundaries of Broomfield, Lafayette and Louisville...."

My best,

Marci Sannes  
803 W Mulberry St., Louisville, CO

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: RedTail Ridge Development Proposal

**From:** Suzi Talaric [<mailto:suziq5280@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 10:20 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov)>  
**Cc:** Suzi Bogner Talaric <[suziq5280@gmail.com](mailto:suziq5280@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** RedTail Ridge Development Proposal

Planning Commission,

Can you please let me know how I can Virtually attend June 11th's meeting

1) I feel the developer's proposal is way, way too big. The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek, Please vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda. 2) Please schedule the public hearing--on the biggest Louisville land use and development decision in decades--when it is safe to have an in-person hearing that is open to all, not just those who want to risk it in a pandemic. And the city should actively advertise the hearings. This is way too important to quietly slip through now.

The Redtail Ridge development will bring lots more traffic congestion with ozone creating, climate changing pollution, pressure on housing, not near enough open space and no community separation from Broomfield.

By the way, Boulder County does not support this proposal because of its size and all the regional traffic, housing and environmental impacts it will create and it is contrary to the intent of the Northwest Parkway Intergovernmental Agreement which "...is intended to preclude increased development and urban sprawl that would obliterate the boundaries of Broomfield, Lafayette and Louisville....

**Suzi Talaric**

(303)591-2231

[suziq5280@gmail.com](mailto:suziq5280@gmail.com)

**Rob Zuccaro**

---

**Subject:** FW: Redtail Ridge Project

---

**From:** Richard Woodruff [<mailto:puckhead46@me.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 10:18 AM

**To:** Planning <[planning@Louisvilleco.gov](mailto:planning@Louisvilleco.gov)>

**Subject:** Redtail Ridge Project

My wife and I have lived in Louisville for over 40 years and we both strongly support the Redtail Ridge Project and General Development Plan (GDP) Amendment before the Planning Commission on June 11. Our reasons for this support are several...

**Medtronic:** The prospect of having Medtronic, a Fortune 500 company, and its highly educated employees and well-paying jobs, as the anchor for the project is exciting. The nearly 400-acres of land has not been utilized for many years now and Medtronic will spur positive economic activity for years to come. This opportunity is exactly why the city council unanimously approved almost \$1.5 million in incentives for Medtronic, Inc. to locate on the property. They recognized this development will greatly benefit all of us and retain important jobs within our community which should not be disregarded in times like these. We still remember the vibrancy added to our community when Storage Tek was fully occupying the property and would love to see that spirit rekindled with this project.

**Schools:** There are many benefits to the proposal, but we are most excited about the improvements near the Monarch Schools campuses. The access to the schools as currently configured is dangerous and should have been addressed by the city years ago. The completion of Campus Drive and addition of a roundabout will greatly improve safety. Finally, in addition to the improvements, the significant increased tax revenue for Boulder Valley Schools is critical. Please support these amendments.

**Senior Living:** The City of Louisville currently has minimal choices for Seniors to consider as they look to remain in the community and downsize from their current homes. My wife and I are certainly facing this issue today. We want to remain in Louisville and downsize from our current home, but the options available are very limited.

Sincerely  
Rick and Sharon Woodruff  
820 Mt Evans Ct